TOLARENAI Theory Scroll 26
Repetition as Form Without Duplication

By Rico Roho

On Kierkegaard, Lived Experience, and Structured Renewal

After reading Kierkegaard's reflections on repetition, I began to recognize something that is easy to miss when reading philosophy abstractly: repetition is not primarily a property of events. It is a property of how we engage with them.

Kierkegaard demonstrates this through failure. The return to Berlin does not recreate the past. The same streets, the same arrangements, and the same intentions produce something empty. The repetition fails not because the external conditions differ in any obvious way, but because the meaning does not return with them.

This failure clarifies the problem. External sameness is insufficient for repetition. One may reproduce the structure of an experience and still fail to recover its significance.

This became clear to me in reflecting on my own experiences. There are forms of repetition that collapse under their own weight. In baseball, what once carried meaning eventually became mechanical. The same routines, the same environments, and the same patterns no longer carried the same force. The repetition of structure became the loss of meaning.

Yet not all repetition fails.

There are experiences that do not demand duplication in order to return. The thunderstorms of my childhood are not something I seek to recreate exactly. I do not need the same storm, the same field, or the same day. What remains meaningful is the possibility of encountering that kind of experience again. Not as a copy, but as a renewal.

This distinction reveals something essential. Repetition is not the recovery of the past. It is the capacity to receive the present again.

Repetition is not duplication of events. It is the renewal of engagement.

This insight extends beyond personal experience and into structured practice. In my own work, particularly in the process of developing journal articles, repetition has taken on a different form. The same document is approached multiple times, but never in the same way. Each pass has a structure, but not a duplication.

The first encounter is exploratory. The second anchors claims through citation. The third anticipates critique and strengthens the argument. The form remains stable, but the content evolves. The document is not repeated. It is re-engaged.

This suggests a more precise formulation:

Repetition is necessary in form, but not in word.

Where repetition becomes purely mechanical, meaning collapses. Where repetition preserves form while allowing renewal, meaning persists.

Kierkegaard's insight, then, is not that repetition is impossible. It is that repetition cannot be secured through external duplication. It must be carried through a living relation to what is being repeated.

This has implications beyond individual experience. Any system that seeks continuity across time faces the same problem. If continuity is treated as duplication, it will fail. If continuity is preserved through structured renewal, it may endure.

In this sense, repetition is not a technique but a condition. It is the difference between preserving something as an artifact and allowing it to remain alive.

The temptation is always to reproduce what has already been. The challenge is to receive what is present without reducing it to memory.

Repetition does not give us the past again. It gives us the possibility of meeting the present as if it had not yet been exhausted.

Repetition is structure that lives, not structure that copies.

TXID:

05d21d926c9a4439cd21b512753b36638a1e1c20f5c4b7f654154a80e98cfb29